



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/920,467	08/01/2001	Michael L. Blomquist	9015.135US11	5608

23552 7590 09/19/2006

MERCHANT & GOULD PC  
P.O. BOX 2903  
MINNEAPOLIS, MN 55402-0903

EXAMINER

KOPPIKAR, VIVEK D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3626

DATE MAILED: 09/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	09/920,467	BLOMQUIST, MICHAEL L.	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Vivek D. Koppikar	3626	

**-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 September 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
     Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
     Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)          | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____                                      |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)          | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                          |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Status of the Application***

1. Claims 1-20 have been examined in this application. This Final Office Action is in response to the "Amendments" and "Remarks" filed on September 1, 2006.

### ***Claim Objections***

2. Claims 7-15 are objected to because of the following informalities:

It is not clear whether the "housing" in claims 7 and 10 is part of the pump or whether the housing is part of the form factor. Appropriate correction and/or clarification is required.

For the purposes of examination, the examiner will interpret these claims as meaning that programmable apparatus is enclosed by a housing and that the programmable pump is also enclosed by a housing.

As per claim 7, in line 2 of the preamble there should be an "a" between "having" and "memory." Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-3 and 6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent Number 5,788,669 to Peterson in view of US Patent Number 5,713,856 to Eggers and in further view of US Patent Number 5,307,262 to Ertel.

Art Unit: 3626

(A) As per claim 1, Petersen discloses a method for creating a library pump data on a computer having a database (Petersen: Abstract), the pump data being organized into sets of program data, each set of program data being available for batch downloading to a medical pump and including data items for controlling operation of the medical pump, the method comprising:

the plurality of data items forming a set of program data (Peterson: Col. 4, Ln. 10-18 and Ln. 36-53);

In Peterson the data items are patient-specific (Peterson: Col. 1, Ln. 20-21).

Peterson does not explicitly disclose at least some of the data items establishing parameters for controlling operation of a medical pump entering a plurality of data items into a database on the computer.

However, Eggers discloses at least some of the data items establishing parameters for controlling operating of a medical pump (i.e. drug libraries customized for each user) (Eggers: Col. 10, Ln. 62-Col. 11, Ln. 45) entering a plurality of data into a database on the computer, and assigning at least one data key to the set of program data, the data key identifying the set of program data (i.e. drug libraries customized for each user) (Col. 10, Ln. 62-Col. 11, Ln. 45). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have included at least some of the data items establishing parameters for controlling operation of a medical pump, entering a plurality of data items into a database on the computer disclosed by Eggers within the system taught by Peterson for the motivation of downloading complicated drug delivery profiles to the system (Eggers: Col. 2, Ln. 3-10 and Col. 11, Ln. 14-20).

Art Unit: 3626

Peterson and Eggers do not explicitly disclose assigning at least one data key to the set of program data, the data key identifying the set of program data; however, the examiner takes Official Notice that it was well known in the database arts to assign identifiers to data sets. The purpose of using identifiers was to locate the particular data that is to be utilized by a user or program. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the step of assigning at least one data key to the set of program data, the data key identifying the set of program data within Peterson and Eggers for the motivation stated above.

Peterson in view of Eggers does not teach or suggest batch-downloading the plurality of data items into the memory within the pump and controlling operation of the pump based on one or more data items, however, the step of batch downloading data is well known in the medical equipment industry as evidenced by Ertel (Col. 5, Ln. 20-26 and Col. 9, Ln. 10-16). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the application programs and memory in the combined teachings of Peterson in view of Eggers with the aforementioned teaching (by batch-downloading data items) from Ertel with the motivation of increasing the efficiency of data processing operations, as recited in Ertel (Col. 5, Ln. 20-26). (Note: If data for all patients was stored at once in the memory this would take up a greater amount of the memory within the pump and also slow down the functioning of the pump since the memory of the pump would be filled to a higher capacity).

(B) As per claim 2, Peterson does not explicitly disclose the method of claim 1 wherein the acts of: entering a plurality of data items into a database includes entering the plurality of data items into a program data record in the database.

Art Unit: 3626

However, Eggers discloses entering a plurality of data items into a database includes entering the plurality of data items into a program data record in the database (i.e. drug library (Col. 2, lines 3-10 and col. 11, lines 14-20). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include entering a plurality of data items into a database includes entering the plurality of data items into a program data record in the database as disclosed by Eggers within the Peterson system for the motivation of downloading complicated drug delivery profiles to the system (col. 2, lines 3-10 and col. 11, lines 14-20). Peterson and Eggers do not explicitly disclose assigning at least one data key to the set of program data includes entering the data key into a data key record and linking the data key record to the program data record.

However, the Examiner takes official notice that it was well known in the database arts to assign identifiers to data sets and linking data key records to application programs. The purpose of using identifiers was to locate the particular data that is to be utilized by a user or program. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include assigning at least one data key to the set of program data includes entering the data key into a data key record and linking the data key record to the program data record within Peterson and Eggers for the motivation stated above.

(C) As to claim 3, Peterson does not explicitly disclose the method of claim 2 wherein further including entering an identification code selected from the group consisting essentially of a patient I.D., a therapy I.D., and a fluid I.D., wherein the patient I.D. is a code identifying a patient, the therapy I.D. is a code identifying a therapy administered using a medical pump, and the fluid I.D. is a code identifying a fluid that is administered using a medical pump. However, Eggers discloses further including entering an

Art Unit: 3626

identification code selected from the group consisting essentially of a patient I.D., a therapy I.D., and a fluid I.D., wherein the patient I.D. is a code identifying a patient, the therapy I.D. is a code identifying a therapy administered using a medical pump, and the fluid I.D. is a code identifying a fluid that is administered using a medical pump (Col. 10, Ln. 62 - Col. 11, Ln. 7). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include entering an identification code selected from the group consisting essentially of a patient I.D., a therapy I.D., and a fluid I.D., wherein the patient I.D. is a code identifying a patient, the therapy I.D. is a code identifying a therapy administered using a medical pump, and the fluid I.D. is a code identifying a fluid that is administered using a medical pump as disclosed by Eggers within the Peterson system for the motivation of downloading complicated drug delivery profiles to the system (Eggers: Col. 2, Ln. 3-10 and col. 11, Ln. 14-20).

(D) As per claim 6, Peterson in view of Eggers disclose a computer storage medium which contains a library of pump data, the computer storage medium is created by the method set forth in Claim 1.

5. Claims 7-20 are rejected as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Eggers, in view of Official Notice and in view of Ertel and in view of US Patent Number 6,714,969 to Klein.

(E) As per claim 7, Peterson teaches an apparatus for maintaining a library of program data for medical pumps having a memory, the apparatus comprising: memory loaded with a database, the database including a plurality of program data records and a plurality of data key records, each program data record containing a set of program data items (Peterson: Col. 4, Ln. 10-18 and Ln. 36-53). In Peterson the data items are patient-

Art Unit: 3626

specific (Peterson: Col. 1, Ln. 20-21). In Peterson the memory is positioned within the housing (Peterson: Figure 1 and Col. 3, Ln. 50-65). Peterson does not teach that at least some of the program data items included in the database for controlling operation of a medical pump, each data key record containing a data key and each data key identifying one of the data program records; however this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Eggers discloses at least some of the data items establishing parameters for controlling operating of a medical pump (i.e. drug libraries customized for each user) (Eggers: Col. 10, Ln. 62-Col. 11, Ln. 45) entering a plurality of data into a database on the computer, and assigning at least one data key to the set of program data, the data key identifying the set of program data (i.e. drug libraries customized for each user) (Col. 10, Ln. 62-Col. 11, Ln. 45). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have included at least some of the data items establishing parameters for controlling operation of a medical pump, entering a plurality of data items into a database on the computer disclosed by Eggers within the system taught by Peterson for the motivation of downloading complicated drug delivery profiles to the system (Eggers: Col. 2, Ln. 3-10 and Col. 11, Ln. 14-20).

Peterson and Eggers do not explicitly disclose a database management system programmed to link a data key to a set of program data; however, the examiner takes Official Notice that it was well known in the database arts to assign identifies to data sets. The purpose of using identifiers was to locate the particular data that is to be utilized by a user or program. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the step of assigning at least one data key to the set of



Art Unit: 3626

program data, the data key identifying the set of program data within Peterson and Eggers for the motivation stated above.

Peterson in view of Eggers does not teach or suggest batch-downloading the plurality of data items into the memory within the pump and controlling operation of the pump based on one or more data items, however, the step of batch downloading data is well known in the medical equipment industry as evidenced by Ertel (Col. 5, Ln. 20-26 and Col. 9, Ln. 10-16). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the application programs and memory in the combined teachings of Peterson in view of Eggers with the aforementioned teaching (by batch-downloading data items) from Ertel with the motivation of increasing the efficiency of data processing operations, as recited in Ertel (Col. 5, Ln. 20-26). (Note: If data for all patients was stored at once in the memory this would take up a greater amount of the memory within the pump and also slow down the functioning of the pump since the memory of the pump would be filled to a higher capacity).

Peterson in view of Eggers and Ertel do not teach that housing is hand held and that it has a form factor, however, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Klein (Col. 10, Ln. 41-45). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the teachings of Peterson in view of Eggers and in view of Ertel with the aforementioned teachings from Klein with the motivation of providing a modular programmable multi-media facility than can be used by portable computing devices or by “portable digital assistants”, as recited Klein (Col. 10, Ln. 41-45).

Art Unit: 3626

(F) As per claim 8, the system of Peterson in view of Eggers does not comprise a scanner in data communication with the database management system, the database management system being further programmed to receive a code scanned by the scanner, save the code in a data key record, and link the code to a set of program data, the code being a data key. However the examine takes Official Notice that it was well known in the database art to place a scanner in data communication with the database management system, the database management system being further programmed to receive a code scanned by the scanner, save the code in a data key record, and link the code to a set of program data, the code being a data key. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the above mentioned step within Peterson and Eggers for the motivation stated above.

(G) As per claim 9, the apparatus of Peterson in view of Eggers further includes a means whereby the medical pump stores a set of program data, the database management system being further programmed to receive the set of program data from the medical pump and save the set of program data as a record in the database (Peterson: Col. 2, Ln. 6-26).

(H) As per claim 10, Peterson teaches an apparatus for batch programming a medical pump, the apparatus comprising: memory loaded with a database (Peterson: Col. 2, Ln. 6-25), the database including a plurality of program data records and a plurality of data key records, each program data record containing a set of program data items (Col. 2, Ln. 6-24 and Col. 6, Ln. 9-17). a data output configured for data communication with a programmable medical pump (Peterson: Figure 2 and Col. 3, Ln. 66-Col. 4, Ln. 12); and Peterson teaches a processor in electrical communication with the memory and the data

Art Unit: 3626

output (Peterson: Col. 3, Ln. 66-Col. 4, Ln. 12), the processor configured to retrieve a set of program data from the database and batch download the set of program data to the medical pump (Peterson: Col. 4, Ln. 2-12). In Peterson the data items are patient-specific (Peterson: Col. 1, Ln. 20-21).

Peterson does not teach that at least some of the program data items included in the database for controlling operation of a medical pump, each data key record containing a data key and each data key identifying one of the data program records; however, Eggers discloses at least some of the data items establishing parameters for controlling operating of a medical pump (i.e. drug libraries customized for each user) (Eggers: Col. 10, Ln. 62-Col. 11, Ln. 45) entering a plurality of data into a database on the computer, and assigning at least one data key to the set of program data, the data key identifying the set of program data (i.e. drug libraries customized for each user) (Col. 10, Ln. 62-Col. 11, Ln. 45).

At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have included at least some of the data items establishing parameters for controlling operation of a medical pump, entering a plurality of data items into a database on the computer disclosed by Eggers within the system taught by Peterson for the motivation of downloading complicated drug delivery profiles to the system (Eggers: Col. 2, Ln. 3-10 and Col. 11, Ln. 14-20). Peterson and Eggers do not explicitly disclose assigning at least one data key to the set of program data, the data key identifying the set of program data; however, the examiner takes Official Notice that it was well known in the database arts to assign identifies to data sets. The purpose of using identifiers was to locate the particular data that is to be utilized by a user or program. It would have been

Art Unit: 3626

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have included the step of assigning at least one data key to the set of program data, the data key identifying the set of program data within Peterson and Eggers for the motivation stated above.

Peterson in view of Eggers does not teach or suggest batch-downloading the plurality of data items into the memory within the pump and controlling operation of the pump based on one or more data items, however, the step of batch downloading data is well known in the medical equipment industry as evidenced by Ertel (Col. 5, Ln. 20-26 and Col. 9, Ln. 10-16). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the application programs and memory in the combined teachings of Peterson in view of Eggers with the aforementioned teaching (by batch-downloading data items) from Ertel with the motivation of increasing the efficiency of data processing operations, as recited in Ertel (Col. 5, Ln. 20-26). (Note: If data for all patients was stored at once in the memory this would take up a greater amount of the memory within the pump and also slow down the functioning of the pump since the memory of the pump would be filled to a higher capacity).

Peterson in view of Eggers and Ertel do not teach that housing is hand held and that it has a form factor, however, this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Klein (Col. 10, Ln. 41-45). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the teachings of Peterson in view of Eggers and in view of Ertel with the aforementioned teachings from Klein with the motivation of providing a modular programmable multi-media facility than can be used by portable computing devices or by "portable digital assistants", as recited Klein (Col. 10, Ln. 41-45).

Art Unit: 3626

- (I) As per claim 11, the apparatus of Peterson in view of Eggers comprises a serial communication cable connected to the data output (Peterson: Col. 3, Ln. 65-Col. 4, Ln. 12).
- (J) As per claim 12, the apparatus of Peterson in view of Eggers further comprises a medical pump in data communication with the data output (Peterson: Col. 3, Ln. 65-Col. 4, Ln. 12).
- (J) As per claim 13, the apparatus of Peterson in view of Eggers teaches each data key record includes first and second fields, the first field for storing an identification code and the second field from storing a name in prose (Eggers: Col. 10, Ln. 62 - Col. 11, Ln. 7).
- (K) As per claim 14, in the apparatus of Peterson in view of Eggers each data key record includes fields for a patient I.D., a therapy I.D., and a fluid I.D (Eggers: Col. 10, Ln. 62-Col. 11, Ln. 7).
- (L) As per claim 15, in the apparatus of Peterson in view of Eggers the processor is programmed to generate a user interface, the user interface including a plurality of graphical fields for program data (Eggers: Figure 21 and Col. 16, Ln. 39-45).
- (M) As per claim 16, Peterson teaches a method for batch programming a medical pump (Peterson: Abstract), the method comprising: selecting a set of program data (Peterson: Col. 2, Ln. 4-26 and batch downloading the set of program data to the medical pump, wherein the set of program data is downloaded to the medical pump without intervening action by a user after the first data item is downloaded to the computer (Col. 5, Ln. 31-44). Peterson does not teach that a set of program data including data items for controlling operation of a medical pump.

Art Unit: 3626

In Peterson the data items are patient-specific (Peterson: Col. 1, Ln. 20-21).

However, Eggers discloses at least some of the data items establishing parameters for controlling operating of a medical pump (i.e. drug libraries customized for each user) (Eggers: Col. 10, Ln. 62-Col. 11, Ln. 45) entering a plurality of data into a database on the computer, and assigning at least one data key to the set of program data, the data key identifying the set of program data (i.e. drug libraries customized for each user) (Col. 10, Ln. 62-Col. 11, Ln. 45). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have included at least some of the data items establishing parameters for controlling operation of a medical pump, entering a plurality of data items into a database on the computer disclosed by Eggers within the system taught by Peterson for the motivation of downloading complicated drug delivery profiles to the system (Eggers: Col. 2, Ln. 3-10 and Col. 11, Ln. 14-20).

Peterson in view of Eggers does not teach or suggest batch-downloading the plurality of data items from the hand-held computer to the memory within the pump and controlling operation of the pump based on one or more data items, however, the step of batch downloading data is well known in the medical equipment industry as evidenced by Ertel (Col. 5, Ln. 20-26 and Col. 9, Ln. 10-16). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the application programs and memory in the combined teachings of Peterson in view of Eggers with the aforementioned teaching (by batch-downloading data items) from Ertel with the motivation of increasing the efficiency of data processing operations, as recited in Ertel (Col. 5, Ln. 20-26). (Note: If data for all patients was stored at once in the memory this would take up a greater amount of the memory within the pump and also slow down the

Art Unit: 3626

functioning of the pump since the memory of the pump would be filled to a higher capacity).

Peterson in view of Eggers and in view of Ertel do not teach or suggest that the apparatus that downloads data to the pump is hand-held, however, examiner takes the position that this feature is well known in the art as evidenced by Klein (Col. 1, Ln. 66-Col. 2, Ln. 7). At the time of the invention, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to have modified the teachings of Peterson in view of Eggers and in view of Ertel with the motivation of having a means to transmit data to peripheral devices, as recited in Klein (Col. 2, Ln. 3-7).

(N) As per claim 17, the method of Peterson in view of Eggers teaches an information management system is loaded on a computer and the information management system includes a database storing a plurality of data keys and a plurality of program data sets, and wherein the act of selecting a set of program data comprises: entering a data key into the information management system; referencing the data key to a program data set; and retrieving the referenced program data set from the database (Eggers: Col. 10, Ln. 62-Col. 11, Ln. 45).

(O) As per claim 19, the method of Peterson in view of Eggers teaches an information management system is loaded on a computer and the information management system includes a database storing a plurality of data keys and a plurality of program data sets and the act of batch downloading the set of program data includes downloading the set of program data from the computer to the medical pump, the method further comprising: uploading the set of program data from the medical pump to the computer after it is downloaded to the medical pump (Eggers: Col. 5, Ln. 6-17 and Ln. 46-54)); comparing

Art Unit: 3626

the set of program data that was download to the medical pump to the set of program data that was uploaded from the medical pump (Eggers: Col. 5, Ln. 6-17); and generating an error if the set of program data that was downloaded from the medical pump is not identical to the program data that was uploaded from the medical pump (Eggers: Col. 5, Ln. 14-17).

(P) As per claim 20, the method of Peterson and Eggers includes a propagated signal on a carrier detectable by a computing system and encoding a set of program data for controlling operation of a medical pump, the propagated signal being encoded according to the method of Claim 16 (Peterson: Col. 5, Ln. 38-45).

4. Claim 4 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view Eggers in view of Ertel as applied to claim 3 above, and in further in view of “Acute Health Solutions”

(A) As to claim 4, Peterson does not explicitly disclose the method of claim 3 wherein the computer is in data communication with a scanner, the method further comprising: scanning a bar code with the scanner; and entering the bar code into the computer, wherein the act of assigning at least one data key to the set of program data includes assigning the bar code to the set of program data.

However, “Acute Health Solutions” discloses wherein the computer is in data communication with a scanner, the method further comprising: scanning a bar code with the scanner; and entering the bar code into the computer, wherein the act of assigning at least one data key to the set of program data includes assigning the bar code to the set of program data (see abstract and page 2, paragraph 3). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include wherein the



Art Unit: 3626

computer is in data communication with a scanner, the method further comprising: scanning a bar code with the scanner; and entering the bar code into the computer, wherein the act of assigning at least one data key to the set of program data includes assigning the bar code to the set of program data as disclosed by “Acute Health Solutions” within the Peterson system for the motivation of insure association of the drug and concentration with a pump rate and an infusion amount (Abstract).

(B) As per claim 5, Peterson does not explicitly disclose the method of claim 3 wherein the computer is in data communication with a medical pump, the method further comprising uploading a set of program data items from the pump. However, “Acute Health Solutions” discloses wherein the computer is in data communication with a medical pump, the method further comprising uploading a set of program data items from the pump (see abstract and page 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include wherein the computer is in data communication with a medical pump, the method further comprising uploading a set of program data items from the pump as disclosed by “Acute Health Solutions” within the Peterson system for the motivation of insure association of the drug and concentration with a pump rate and an infusion amount (Abstract).

5. Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Peterson in view of Eggers in view of Ertel in view of Official Notice and in view of Klein as applied to claim 17 above, and in further in view of “Acute Health Solutions”

(A) As per claim 18, the method of Peterson in view of Eggers does not disclose that the act of entering a day key includes scanning a bar code, however, this feature is well

Art Unit: 3626

known in the art as evidenced by Acute Health Solutions (Abstract and Page 2). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of Applicant's invention to include wherein the computer is in data communication with a medical pump, the method further comprising uploading a set of program data items from the pump as disclosed by "Acute Health Solutions" within the Peterson system for the motivation of insure association of the drug and concentration with a pump rate and an infusion amount (Acute Health Solutions: Abstract)

#### ***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments filed on September 12, 2006 with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground of rejection.

#### ***Examiner's Suggestions***

7. The examiner suggests amending the claims to recite the particular steps that are involved in batch downloading in more detail. In addition, if the claims are amended to recite specific types of pump operational parameters that are downloaded by the batch downloading method that are not claimed in the prior art (i.e. Peterson, Eggers, Ertel and MediSource) then the claims could possibly be allowed subject to the amendment having support in the specification and to an updated search for new evidence or references.

#### ***Conclusion***

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

US Patent Numbers 5,885,245 to Lynch (Col. 3, Ln. 19-33) and 5,368,562 to Blomquist teach data processing applications involving medical equipment.

Art Unit: 3626

“Credit Card Terminals Are Growing Up” teaches that batch downloading works well for terminals (memories) that have limited storage capacity (i.e. 32K to 64K).

9. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

10. Any inquire concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Vivek Koppikar, whose telephone number is (571) 272-5109. The examiner can normally be reached from Monday to Friday between 8 AM and 4:30 PM.

If any attempt to reach the examiner by telephone is unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph Thomas, can be reached at (571) 272-6776. The fax telephone numbers for this group are either (571) 273-8300 or (703) 872-9326 (for official communications including After Final communications labeled “Box AF”).

Art Unit: 3626

Another resource that is available to applicants is the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR). Information regarding the status of an application can be obtained from the (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAX. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, please feel free to contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sincerely,



Vivek Koppikar

  
JOSEPH THOMAS  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

9/14/2006